DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 061 CS 205 782

AUTHOR Thomas, Susan
TITLE Teacher Interview Report. Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 73p.: For related documents see CS 205 779-786.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Change: Change Strategies: Comparative Analysis: Elementary Secondary Education: *Inservice Teacher Education: Interviews: *Program Effectiveness: *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Behavior: Teachers: Teaching Methods: Writing (Composition): *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Bay Area Writing Project

ABSTRACT

As part of the evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP), 12 teachers participating in the BAWP Summer Invitational Program and 11 teachers who participated in BAWP inservice programs were interviewed before and after their BAWP experiences. The BAWP training appeared to change both inservice and invitational teachers regardless of teacher characteristics. Teachers in the summer invitational program used a wider range of instructional techniques after their BAWP training, and they reported more frequent use of specific techniques. The inservice teachers reported a larger absolute number of significant changes in classroom practices and course emphases. BAWP training did not cause excessive emphasis on any one type of writing at the expense of other types. When BAWP teachers were compared to a group of non-BAWP teachers, it was found that the BAWP teachers were more likely to teach writing as a process rather than a product, to use a variety of techniques to teach writing, and to use peer feedback to involve students in the writing and editing process. BAWP did not seem effective in causing participants to write more (either professionally or personally) or in increasing the leadership activities of the participating teachers. (RI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191061

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION OF THE BAY AREA WRITING PROJECT

A Technical Report

Funded By
The Carnegie Corporation

1979

Evaluation Directed by
Michael Scriven
Director, Evaluation Institute
University of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94117

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael Scriven

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS205782

This report represents only ONE component of the total Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project. The other Evaluation reports are available through the BAWP office. For an up-to-date list, including current prices, write

James R. Gray, Director
Bay Area Writing Project
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

TEACHER INTERVIEW REPORT

Written by Susan Thomas

Suggestions contributing to the final report were made by :

Barbara Davis, Catharine Keech and Michael Scriven

BAWP Evaluation Unit

December 1978

Teacher Interview Report

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Overview

As part of the evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP), a sample of teachers who participated in the Summer Invitational Program (called "Invitational" teachers) or in inservice training were interviewed before (1977) and after their BAWP experiences (1978). In addition, a group of comparison teachers, selected to "match" the BAWP Summer Institute teachers, were interviewed during the same periods. The purpose of the interviews was to explore the impact of BAWP on teaching practices, attitudes and professional activities.

Differences between the Groups Prior to BAWP Training

1. Only a few small differences were observed in teaching practices or demographic characteristics between Invitational (N=12) and Comparison teachers (N=23) in Spring 77 (before the BAWP program). This suggests that the two groups were similar in many important respects and that the Comparison teachers could serve as a valid comparison group.

2. The Inservice teachers (N=11) were quite different from the Invitational and Comparison teachers on several important dimensions such as average size of class taught, total teaching load, and years of teaching experience. These initial differences make it difficult to compare directly the Inservice teachers to teachers in the other two groups.

Differences between the Groups Subsequent to BAWP Training

1. BAWP training appeared to change both Inservice and Invitational teachers regardless of years of teaching experience, age, level of education, or particular teaching style.

2. The two types of BAWP training (Inservice and Summer Invitational) seemed to be associated with different kinds of effects:

   a. After exposure to the Summer Invitational Program, teachers used a wider range of instructional techniques than they had prior to their training and a wider range than Comparison and Inservice teachers.

   b. The Invitational teachers reported more frequent use of specific techniques, suggesting that the intense training of the Summer Invitational Program was necessary for widespread implementation of individual techniques.

   c. Inservice teachers reported a larger absolute number of significant changes (compared to the other groups of teachers) in classroom practices and course emphases.

3. Results indicate that teachers receiving BAWP training (Invitational and Inservice) were more likely than Comparison teachers to:

   a. Teach writing as a process not a product (with special attention to the prewriting phase)

   b. Use a variety of techniques to teach writing (although focusing most heavily on encouraging students to write whole discourses rather than depending on exercises per se).

   c. Involve students in the writing and editing process through the use of peer feedback.

4. BAWP training did not seem to result in excessive emphasis on any one type of writing (e.g. expressive writing) at the expense of any other. In fact,

BAWP training might have offset pressures in the educational environment to emphasize certain aspects of instruction (academic writing, exercises to teach mechanics, etc.)

5. In general, many more techniques were used by both BAWP and Comparison teachers than were used solely by the BAWP groups. Thus, in large part, BAWP is disseminating practices known and implemented by a sample of highly skilled members of the English teaching profession. That no promising practices were in significant use by the Comparison groups indicates that BAWP has been effective in identifying and incorporating such practices into their program.

6. The enthusiastic response and overall teacher satisfaction generated by the BAWP program may be particularly important in developing a sense of teacher efficacy (found by a 1977 RAND Report to correlate most highly with teacher change).[1]

7. BAWP training did not seem effective in:

   a. Causing participants to spend more time writing, for professional or personal reasons, (at least, in the year immediately following treatment).

   b. Making outstanding teachers (i.e. the Invitational teachers) leaders to any greater degree than other forces in the teaching environment which increased leadership activities of the Comparison group as well. (BAWP was more effective, however, in facilitating a particular <u>type</u> of leadership activity: presentations and consultancies at Inservices.)

<u>Conclusions</u>

It must of course be remembered that the actual degree of change in teacher behavior needed to bring a measurable change in student writing skills remains a question for future consideration.

1. That BAWP did not seem to cause measurable impact in the majority of areas examined does not necessarily mean that its training will not eventually

enable teachers to improve student writing. Its more dramatic effects may occur in aspects of behavior and attitude not measured by the interview questionnaire.

2. A survey of research conducted on the effects of inservice training programs held during the past five years suggests that

   a. BAWP is attempting to change aspects of teacher behavior which have proved most difficult to alter i.e. attitudes and classroom behavior;

   b. The number of observed changes in teacher behavior and methods seems impressive in comparison with inservice training efforts in language arts and other fields.

3. The effects of having teachers write in the Inservice and the Invitational programs need to be more carefully examined, particularly with reference to the types of changes that occur in teachers' writing and the effects such writing experiences have on their ability to teach writing.

4. More careful examination is needed of the extent to which BAWP affects teacher participation in all kinds of leadership activities (not just in inservice leadership), and whether one type of professional activity should be valued over another for improving teachers' leadership expertise and impact on other teachers.

Limitations to this Study

1. Sample: The teachers chosen for interviewing and testing represent a small percentage of the total number who received BAWP training in 1977-1978. Altogether, 25 participated in the 1977 Summer Invitational and an estimated 800 participated in a total of 41 inservice programs. From these larger groups 12 secondary Invitational teachers and 11 inservice teachers from 2 inservice programs were selected for interviewing.

2. Methods: Structured, 40-50 minute interviews with teachers comprise the only source of information for this report. No other measures of classroom practice, such as observation, were undertaken.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Methods and Procedures	2
Groups	2
Interview Forms	2
Questions of Interest	3
Analyses	4
Comparability of Teachers: 1977	5
Demographic Characteristics	5
Consulting and Inservice Activities	5
Teacher Responsibilities	6
Classroom Practices	7
Teaching Context	8
Summary	8
Impact of BAWP	9
Teaching Writing as a Process	11
Teaching Mechanics	13
Teaching Different Types of Writing	14
Peer Feedback	17
Teachers' Writing	17
Teachers' Inservice and Consulting Activities	19
Uniqueness of BAWP	23
Research on the Effectiveness of Inservice Training	24
Tables	27
Footnotes	38

Methods and Procedures

Groups

The following report discusses data gathered in interviews conducted in 1977 and 1978 with three groups of teachers:

1) Invitational teachers (or Summer Fellows): This group includes the twelve secondary-level participants in the 1977 BAWP Summer Invitational, whose members are selected on the basis of their reputations as outstanding teachers.[2] A thirteenth teacher had to be dropped in 1978, because he was not teaching any writing classes. 48% of the total 1977 Invitational enrolled and approximately 11% of all Invitational teachers (1974-78) are represented by this group.

2) Comparison teachers: Twenty-three teachers were selected as a comparison group to the Invitational teachers by the Evaluation staff, using the same identification techniques as the BAWP staff, i.e. recommendations by administrators, department chairpersons, and leaders in the field of English language arts instruction.

3) Inservice teachers: These eleven teachers participated in BAWP Inservice training during the school year, and represent approximately 1.4% of all the teachers receiving BAWP Inservice training during 1977-1978. For purposes of ascertaining change, only data from those teachers who were tested and interviewed in both 1977 and 1978 are included.

Interview Forms

The design of the interview questionnaire presented some formidable challenges to the Evaluation Unit in 1977. At that time, BAWP consciously avoided presenting a single set of methods guaranteed to improve students' writing.[3] The emphasis was on exposing teachers to a variety of techniques. Thus it was difficult to determine what exactly might change as a result of participation in the Summer Invitational or Inservice experience. The 1977 interview, therefore, contained a large number of open-ended questions designed to encourage individual responses on such broad topics as the following: approach

to teaching writing, purpose of writing assignments, grading practices, etc. In addition to these discursive questions, specific probes concerning professional activities, English department support and guidance, classroom activities, and composition techniques were included. Questions selected for statistical analysis and participants' responses to them are reported in Appendices B and C.

The 1978 questionnaire was revised on the basis of data provided from the 1977 interviews. Teachers were asked in greater detail about various methods and approaches they had learned about during the 1977 Summer Program. These questions were designed to measure which methods were implemented and to determine which of these techniques, if any, were being used by the Comparison teachers. In both years the questionnaires had to be short enough to be administered during a 40-50 minute period on the day student writing performance was tested. In some cases this time proved to be inadequate, and teachers completed the forms at their convenience and mailed them to the Evaluation Unit.[4]

Questions of Interest

The teacher interviews were designed to provide descriptive information about classroom practices and the impact of BAWP training. (These data were also used in conjunction with information collected during the student writing assessment to provide insights into which teaching practices affect student writing performance.) Analyses were undertaken to answer the following questions:

1) To what extent were teachers in all groups comparable in their personal characteristics and classroom practices in 1977? In particular we wished to determine if the Comparison teachers served as an adequate comparison group for the specially-selected "superior" Invitational

teachers. Did the Inservice group in fact represent a greater range of skill and experience than either of the other two groups?

2) In what ways, if any, did BAWP teachers change after exposure to the summer program or to year-long training? Did the more intense Summer Invitational experience result in significantly different effects than the less intensive 10-week Inservices conducted during the year?[5]

3) What distinct set of practices could be identified with the BAWP program which were not in use by the Comparison group? Were there promising practices that the Comparison teachers used that had not been incorporated by BAWP?

4) How might recent research on inservice programs help us understand the impact of BAWP? What is known about teacher change resulting from inservice training?

Responses to these questions will be discussed below and should be read with the following limitation kept firmly in mind: conclusions depend on self-report only. Due to cost restrictions, no classroom observations or interviews with students, or any other data were used in these analyses.

Analyses

The data were subjected to a variety of statistical tests to identify significant results. A complete list of those items found to be statistically significant at $p \leq .05$ are reported in Table 1 and will be discussed in the following sections.

Interview data collected in 1977 were examined to determine how comparable Invitational and Comparison teachers were in the following five areas: personal and demographic characteristics, inservice and consulting activities, teacher responsibilities, classroom practices, and teaching context.

Demographic Characteristics

In terms of personal and demographic characteristics such as sex, age, level of education, and years of teaching experience, the three groups were statistically equivalent, with one exception: the Inservice teachers reported significantly more years of teaching experience than did the Invitational group. (See Tables 1 and 2). The Inservice group tended to be somewhat older and had almost twice as many teachers with 16 or more years teaching experience than did the other two groups shown in Table 2. In light of the RAND Report (1977)[6] finding that years of teaching experience correlated inversely with ability to use innovative practices, these characteristics suggest that the Inservice group should be potentially the most difficult to affect by any treatment.

Consulting and Inservice Activities

A second set of comparisons relating to consulting and inservice activities during the 1976-1977 school year showed that about the same proportion of teachers were involved in professional consulting activities across all three groups. (See Table 3.) This finding suggests that the Inservice group was no less outstanding than the other, highly select groups in terms of consulting activities. With regard to inservice activities, visual inspection reveals that many more of both the Inservice and Comparison teachers were

involved in some type of inservice training during that year compared to the Invitational group. The reason for this difference may be due in part to our coding procedures. Teachers were credited with whatever inservice experience they listed, regardless of duration or type; thus inservice training included one-day seminars as well as courses of several weeks duration making clear, unambiguous interpretation of this finding difficult.

Another indicator of initial comparability of teacher characteristics was examined: the amount of time that teachers spent on writing not required for the job. As shown in Table 4, the Inservice group in 1977 seemed least inclined to do such writing; in contrast, the Invitational group reported significantly more hours writing than the Comparison group. Because BAWP encourages teachers to be writers, this finding suggests that several prospective Invitational members exhibited BAWP-desired behavior prior to training.

Teacher Responsibilities

A third area of inquiry included various measures of teacher duties and responsibilities. These are listed in Table 5.

Two statistically significant differences were found.

1) 1977 Inservice teachers reported heavier teaching loads (more total students) than Invitational teachers in that same year.

2) 1977 Inservice teachers reported a larger class size of students tested than did Comparison teachers in the same year.

Such disparities in total students and class size tested could have some effect on implementation of new teaching practices as well as on student performance on the writing assessment.

Visual inspection of Table 5 shows that there were no major differences among the groups on the first two items: average number of classes taught or average number of unpaid duties. Overall, however, the Invitational teachers

seemed to carry a smaller student load but slightly more extra duties including department chairships, district planning and advisory duties, as well as sponsorship of student groups and events. Thus, this group at the outset seemed slightly more active in leadership roles, a behavior that the summer training experience both relies on and intends to develop.

Classroom practices

Use of specific classroom practices and teacher's enjoyment of classes constitute a fourth area in which the groups were examined. (See the list A-D, in the next section for a complete description of these items.) The few significant differences found before exposure to the BAWP program were:

1) The Inservice and Comparison groups made greater use of workbooks/-exercises in teaching mechanics than did the Invitational group.

2) The Invitational teachers made greater use of peer feedback than the Comparison group.

3) The Comparison group a larger number of expository writing techniques than the Invitational teachers (e.g. paragraphing, thesis formation).

Variations in student load among the groups may account for the significant difference in teaching mechanics. With a larger number of students, exercises/workbooks would require less correction time than grading whole discourses. There is no ready explanation for the third finding, other than that, perhaps, the Invitational teachers are less concerned with "traditional techniques" in teaching expository writing. That the Invitational teachers did report that 58% of student writing assignments were for academic success, diminishes the possibility that they teach less expository (the most common academic) writing than Comparison teachers.

It is interesting to note that the Invitational group reported widespread use of BAWP-emphasized techniques such as peer feedback and whole discourses prior to entry in the summer program. Thus, these teachers may be selected

for their compatibility with some BAWP emphases. These commonly shared behaviors may provide an important unifying force in what otherwise (according to the deliberate intention of Jim Gray, BAWP Director) is a diverse mixture of individuals with divergent viewpoints about writing. How this might affect the type of impact of the summer will be considered below.

Teaching Context

A fifth set of measures examined characteristics of English Departments, and the teaching context of the groups. (See Table 6). When asked to evaluate the morale of their own English Department and the usefulness of English Department meetings, all three groups reported similar perceptions. However, in describing the degree of shared planning for English courses, some differences were noted, according to data collected from open-ended questions. The Comparison teachers indicated a larger incidence of department-wide planning. The two BAWP groups reported less of this type of activity, but a similar amount of planning occurred with individual or small groups of peers. Only the Invitational and Comparison groups reported instances of no shared planning.

Summary

In general, few differences were found between Invitational and Comparison groups prior to BAWP training. Thus it would seem that the effort to identify a Comparison group comparable to the specially selected Invitational group was successful, at least on the dimensions in our interview forms. In contrast, the Inservice group differed in many important respects from the Invitational and Comparison groups. The differences between the two BAWP groups (Inservice and Invitational) seemed predictable, considering the dif-

ference in selection process. Invitational teachers were selected as outstanding teachers of writing; Inservice teachers came voluntarily, in most cases, to BAWP programs to improve their skills in teaching writing. The Inservice teachers, therefore, represent a broader range of skills. The existence of differences between the Inservice and the other two groups requires caution in using either the Invitational or the Comparison teachers as anything other than a "weak" comparison group for the Inservice. We are thus unable to suggest how these Inservice teachers might have changed without their BAWP experience. However, it is possible to speculate, on the basis of such research as the RAND study, along with the results of this study, that change among Inservice teachers would be unlikely without some sort of intervention.[7]

IMPACT OF BAWP

The following items asked both in 1977 and 1978 were useful in ascertaining the impact of BAWP on teachers. These items include:

a) general approach to teaching: relative emphasis on three different types of writing (literary, academic, practical); pages of writing assigned each week; percent of approach and materials that were new; use of peer feedback and lay readers.

b) clusters of related practices: individual items concerning the teaching of (1) expository writing, (2) expressive writing, and (3) mechanics. (See Appendix D for a list of items included in each cluster.)

c) specific techniques: teaching of mechanics (using exercises, workbooks, whole discourses, or other methods), teaching specific modes or genres (argumentation, literary criticism, precis, descriptive writing, etc.).

d) teacher effects: teacher enjoyment of class tested, hours writing not required for the job, inservice training and leadership experiences.

A second set of items appearing only in the 1978 interview measured teachers' use of techniques and practices demonstrated during the 1977 Summer Invitational Program and in the Inservice sessions. Responses to these items, which allowed identification of practices unique to the BAWP groups, included:

a) prewriting techniques

b) revision and rewriting practices

c) emphasis on writing during classtime (percent of prewriting, writing, and rewriting that could be completed in classtime allowed for it)

d) writing strategies: writing for different audiences, for different purposes, in different modes, and from different points of view

e) special exercises: sentence combining, modeling of styles or forms, use of concrete details (showing not telling)

f) teacher effects: hours spent reading student work from the class tested, hours spent writing along with students, or preparing curriculum materials

Statistically significant differences among the three groups were observed in a variety of areas. (See Table 1). Before discussing these, however, a description of what seem to be dominant BAWP emphases might provide a context for understanding the findings.

BAWP's Approach to Writing Inservices

Although BAWP staff continue to believe that their strength lies in presenting a wide variety of techniques, their training programs tend to reinforce certain approaches more than others. Most importantly, their model stresses participatory experiences: teachers in both the Invitational and Inservice BAWP programs write and respond to their peers' writing, and teachers, not ivory tower experts, make the majority of presentations. Inevitably, because the teaching of language development is such a complex process, the content of these presentations ranges widely.[8]

An important goal of BAWP is to give teachers a "larger vision"[9] of writing as a tool for personal growth as well as for academic success. Wri-

ting is conceived as a rich ongoing expressive experience, not confined to single products or limited to brief moments. To accomplish this task BAWP deliberately incorporates methods which may on the surface appear to be mutually exclusive. Reduction of student errors using both individual exercises and whole discourses is recommended, although the use of the latter is emphasized. Writing for self-expression and for academic success both share the spotlight, although, as will be seen, the latter predominates in usage. To arm teachers with such a broad vision of possibilities, with experiential interaction, not just cognitive knowledge, encourages diversity in application of the training. To use teachers as an essential ingredient in the process, to demonstrate how much they and their peers do know (particularly at a time when the English teaching profession is almost daily confronted with its failures) understandably generates an enthusiastic response and, apparently, an increased belief in teacher efficacy.

Consistent with this discussion, the effects of BAWP training merge into three related themes:

1) teaching writing as a process not a product (with emphasis on prewriting and rewriting activities);

2) using a diverse group of techniques to do so;

3) incorporating peer feedback as an essential tool for improving writing.

Teaching Writing as a Process

Statistically significant differences occurred among the groups on the following dimensions (see Table 1 for details):

A. General Approach to Writing

1. A larger proportion of total prewriting techniques were used by both the Invitational and Inservice groups relative to the Comparison group;

2. A greater proportion of Inservice than Comparison teachers made use of prewriting and writing during class time.

3. A greater proportion of Invitational teachers than Comparison teachers provided class time for rewriting.

B. Specific Techniques in Teaching Writing

1. A larger percent of the Invitational group taught individual prewriting techniques including free writing, idea diagramming, and "other" exercises (See Appendix G for a list) relative to the Comparison group.

2. A larger percent of the Invitational group taught writing for different audiences relative to the Comparison group.

These findings support the BAWP claim of strength in diversity, particularly for the Inservice program. The general strategy of prewriting was implemented in diverse ways by individual teachers using different techniques. Had not a variety of techniques been offered, however, some Inservice teachers might not have found a general approach appealing or applicable. These findings also indicate the effects the richer Summer Invitational experience had upon teaching practices. Most Invitational teachers (according to interview data) had used some prewriting techniques prior to the summer, suggesting again that they were "BAWP-oriented" prior to exposure to the program. Most said they had learned additional prewriting techniques which they planned to use at the conclusion of the treatment. Thus, combining diverse presentations with prior practice seemed to consolidate use of specific techniques as well as to make individuals more versatile.

In summary, after the relatively "weaker" Inservice experiences, only general approaches were implemented; both general strategies and specific techniques were in use after the Summer Invitational training. Whether these findings result entirely from the nature of the program (as other research suggests[10]) or from the interaction of program with pre-program teacher practices, cannot be determined from the present data. In responses to open-ended

questions, however, a majority of the Invitational teachers praised the variety of techniques gained in the summer experience. Most Invitational teachers said they continued to discover in their materials new resources for their classrooms. Thus another important assumption of the BAWP model seems justified: excellent teachers (as well as those of more ordinary talent) can continue to benefit from additional training.[11]

Teaching Mechanics

BAWP teachers' approach to the teaching of mechanics also seemed altered by an emphasis on writing as process not product. Teachers were asked in both years to indicate how much they used exercises/workbooks, whole discourses, or other methods in teaching mechanics. (See Table 7). Typically the BAWP approach has been to improve student writing by encouraging students to write whole discourses, treating errors in grammar and usage within the context of the writer's total purpose. Yet, the BAWP stance on this matter has not been one-dimensional. Presentations were given in the Invitational and the Inservice sessions for teaching sentence-combining and for increasing fluency through a variety of specific prewriting exercises ("finger exercises").

The net effect of this dual-emphasis on the whole and the parts of a composition is as follows. The Inservice group, which in the pre-training interview reported a significantly greater use of exercises/workbooks than did the Invitational group, recorded a significant gain in the use of whole student discourses for teaching mechanics and a significantly higher level of use than Comparison teachers in 1978. The Invitational group increased the use they made of exercises and workbooks, compared to the Inservice group (a reversal of the pre-training positions of both groups) and registered a modest gain from 1977-1978 in their use of "other methods". The gain of the Invitational teachers in the use of exercises/workbooks was large enough to remove

the significant difference that existed relative to the Comparison group in 1977. Here again the effects would seem to be explained by differences in the two training experiences. BAWP's major emphasis on whole discourses affected the Inservice teachers; they depended more on whole discourses and less on exercises and workbooks. In contrast, the Invitational group diversified their approach, relying less on whole discouses and more on the other two approaches to teaching mechanics.

Teaching Different Types of Writing

Differences in the effects of Summer as opposed to Inservice training also appeared in the relative amount of importance teachers attached to different types of writing: for personal growth, for academic success, and for practical/social success. (See Table 8 for descriptive statistics and Appendix G for an explanation of the terms.) All three groups reported declines in amount of time spent by students on practical/social writing.[12] This seems surprising, for many of the BAWP summer presentations as well as those in the Inservice sessions incorporated some assignments designed to stimulate improved language skills through use of practical and social writing. Thus predictably, this type should have increased in use. That it did not and that academic writing gained in the percent of time Inservice and Comparison teachers spent on it, and remained a strong emphasis of the Invitational group, suggests that perhaps BAWP-trained and other teachers are responsive to the "back to basics" movement, at least in its more traditional sense of focusing on expository writing rather than practical and social writing. (The practice of the latter type of writing often represents a more modern response to the Hart Bill requirements).

Some qualifications of this point are required, however. Even though the Invitational group increased its academic emphasis slightly, the Comparison group increased even more, reaching a level above the Invitational group in

1978. Thus, the summer program might have caused the Invitational group to retain their initial level of emphasis on the three types of writing, i.e. to maintain a more diverse approach, in spite of strong environmental pressure to do otherwise. All these findings should be considered cautiously, however, since there were some class changes from 1977-1978 in all three groups which possibly could account as much for the changes in emphasis as the environmental factors. (See Appendix A for a list of classes.) In addition, the distinctions among the three types were not sharply defined. (See Appendix G for explanation.) That the cluster totals for expository writing did not change for any of the groups, pre to post, nor reach statistical significance between groups might mean that teachers are changing type of writing but not techniques used to teach them. (The practices included in this cluster are listed in Appendices B and C.) For example, argumentative prose could be used equally well for writing a business letter and for an academic essay.

In light of the "back to basics" influence, the group totals recorded for writing for personal pleasure and growth may make more sense. The Inservice groups and the Invitational teachers heard presentations on the value of personal writing (writing about topics chosen by and important to the individual student writer) for developing fluency and writing enjoyment. Thus it would be expected that BAWP teachers would emphasize such writing. That the two BAWP groups spent approximately the same amount of time on this type of writing in 1977 and 1978 while the Comparison group declined markedly, suggests, perhaps, that without BAWP training and in light of contemporary educational pressures, the BAWP teachers might have also reported declines.

One final question to consider about the relative emphasis on different types of writing involves the criticism made against BAWP for allegedly focusing too much on one particular type of writing--expressive or personal. In

follow-up interviews, some participants in the 1977 Invitational Program at first complained about the "excessive" emphasis on expressive and creative writing. (Expressive writing here refers to writing as a process in which ideas are clarified and developed; it can lead either to expository or creative--i.e. literary--product.) Upon reflection, however, they acknowledged later in their interviews that the content had been balanced and included a variety of types of writing. Perhaps such responses illustrate one problem BAWP faces in trying to implement a pluralistic program: English teachers often gain or maintain a monolithic approach to teaching writing, either through uniform departmental emphasis on a single approach or isolation of individuals. Typically, teachers become polarized through such experiences and perhaps less able to evaluate and benefit from a variety of techniques and emphases. Thus, initially teachers may have difficulty benefitting from the BAWP approach. The data concerning different types of writing support BAWP's claim of diversity of approach and impact. Clearly academic writing receives a dominant proportion of attention from teachers in all three groups, yet other types of writing are also practiced.

The results of the clusters of items concerning expressive and expository writing also uphold this claim. (See Appendices B and C for lists of techniques in each of the clusters.) The only significant change found from pre to post was a decrease in the number of expository writing techniques taught by the Comparison teachers, relative to the Invitational group. Thus, not only in the emphasis given the types of writing, but also in the numbers of individual techniques used to teach these different types, there seems to be a consistent, pre-post pattern of balanced teacher behavior.

Peer Feedback

Considering the prominence given to small writing groups in both the Invitatio in both Invitational and Inservice groups causes little surprise. (See Table 9.) In 1978, both BAWP groups reported a larger use of peer feedback relative to the Comparison teachers. Although the Inservice group significantly increased use of this technique from 1977 to 1978, the Invitational group reported a greater use of peer feedback.

The data gathered in open-ended questions suggest an interaction of the summer training with the teachers' previous experience with peer feedback. A number of Invitational teachers who had used small groups prior to the summer reported modifying the format as a result of their summer experiences. In one case a teacher began working more with the whole class, having seen how effectively BAWP Director Jim Gray worked with the summer Invitational teachers. In other cases, teachers used different techniques for training their student how to respond in small groups. In another case, a teacher reported having tried small groups, being dissatisfied with them, and discontinuing them early in the school year.

Teacher's Writing

One of BAWP's central tenets is that "teachers of writing must write". Accordingly, teacher writing dominates both the Summer and Inservice programs. This experience includes various types of writing and can function in several different ways for both the Invitational and the Inservice participants. First, participation in different writing exercises allows teachers to explore a variety of approaches to teaching writing. They in fact can extend their repertoire while "learning by doing". Second, personally experiencing the frustrations and successes of writing hopefully enables teachers to work with

more empathy and insight when teaching their students. Third, the experience of writing curriculum materials (a suggested activity after completion of the Invitational) or using materials in an inservice (prepared by the Teacher Consultant giving the presentation) can broaden the professional knowledge and expertise of participating teachers. Thus either by observing a model or directly engaging in such writing, teachers can improve their knowledge and hopefully their abilities through applied practice. Finally, the Invitational participants engage in a different type of professional writing: formal statement of their views on the teaching of writing in a position paper.

It would be expected, therefore, that the impact of BAWP training should have extended to hours of writing related and unrelated to the job. In analyzing data from the interviews regarding types of writing, four differences were noted (see Table 10):

1) A greater number of hours were spent by the Comparison teachers on preparation of curriculum materials;

2) For both the Invitational and the Comparison teachers, a greater amount of time was spent on writing for the job (student assignments and curriculum materials) than on personal types of writing;

3) There was a greater tendency for Invitational teachers than for Comparison teachers to spend more time on writing not required for the job.

4) Invitational teachers failed to maintain the significantly larger number of hours of writing not required for the job recorded in 1977 (shown in Table 4).

These findings suggest, however, that BAWP may not have been very effective in changing the amount of time spent writing in the short run. Because writing <u>for</u> the job was not measured in 1977, the degree of <u>change</u> (if any occurred) cannot be determined. Nevertheless, Comparison teachers spent more hours preparing curriculum materials in 1978, than did the Invitational teachers. Both groups indicated comparable percentages of course material that was

new in both years (See Appendices B and C). So it would seem that there was no greater need for Comparison teachers to prepare curriculum materials. On the surface, then, the Comparison teachers wrote more.

Some alternative interpretations of this finding should be considered. Did BAWP training make the Invitational teachers more efficient writers, able to prepare curriculum materials in fewer hours? Or, did the wealth of materials gained from the summer reduce the time these teachers spent in preparing their own materials? Alternately, did the emphasis on having students write create a curriculum, i.e. a greater reliance on student writing as the course content? BAWP's programs place such a heavy emphasis on making teachers write, that these questions deserve more careful study than the interview questions allowed.

Did either characteristic--more writing in preparation of curriculum materials or more materials (indicated by use of single techniques)--correlate with better performance on the BAWP writing assessment? A weak to moderate .35 correlation was found between hours of teacher writing not required for the job and student performance on Essay 1 in 1977 (i.e. as teacher's hours of personal writing increased, scores on the descriptive essay also increased). This finding is consistent with BAWP's contention that teachers who write will be more effective teachers of writing. (See Appendix D for a complete list of significant correlations of interview items with performance on the student writing assignment.)

Teachers' Inservice and Consulting Activities

Involvement in Inservice training is a second important area of teacher behavior where BAWP impact should have occurred. Table 11 reveals some findings consistent with BAWP's philosophy that even skilled teachers can benefit

from additional training. Interestingly, the Invitational group maintained the same level of involvement in Inservice activities after their summer experience as they had before. More predictably, during the time that they were attending BAWP programs the Inservice teachers recorded a drop in other inservice training activity. In contrast to both groups, the Comparison teachers seemed to increase inservice involvement slightly.

Consulting and leadership activities increased in both the Invitational and Comparison groups to a remarkable extent, from 1977-1978 (see Table 11). Although the 1978 activities of the Comparison group were not as extensive as the Invitational group, they appear comparable and all the more notable due to lack of any special leadership training among Comparison teachers. In part, such an increase among the Comparison teachers may be explained by changes in California state laws. More of the Comparison teachers than the Invitational group participated on district level committees to develop proficiency tests, but there seemed to be no consistent reports about effects of their participation. In contrast, two of the BAWP Invitational teachers who did participate in such activities reported successfully influencing their committees to adopt an essay writing component in the test. They credited their BAWP experience with reinforcing their belief that students should write on these tests. The majority of proficiency tests described in interviews lacked such a writing component. Thus BAWP training seems to have made a positive contribution to this type of leadership activity.

That Comparison teachers seemed to be engaged in as many professional leadership activities as Invitational teachers in 1978 suggests that excellent teachers typically may be found in these roles. BAWP provides opportunities for a specific kind of leadership: presentations and consultancies at Inservices. (See Appendix F1 for a list of the presentations by the 1977 secondary

Summer Invitational teachers at BAWP Inservices.) It remains to be determined to what extent BAWP affects teacher participation in other kinds of leadership activities, and whether one type of professional activity should be valued over another for improving leadership expertise and impact on other teachers.

Because Comparison teachers displayed such a high level of leadership activity, the question must be raised of whether the Summer Invitational "trains leaders" or whether it recognizes and promotes them. One Summer Invitational teacher indicated that the summer experience had proved crucial, both in renewing a commitment to teaching and in facilitating consulting opportunities. Two other Fellows registered some disappointment, feeling that the promise of "being trained to be a leader" had not in fact been kept, that the experience of making a single presentation had been insufficient to develop confidence and leadership skills. Most stated that they had been involved in leadership activities of some sort prior to entering the summer program and that its most important effect had been to give them a deepened sense of professional involvement, a network of professional contacts which in many cases led to leadership opportunities. Thus it would seem that the summer experience, rather than being a training opportunity, serves more to facilitate use of skills already present. The preceding discussion should not be interpreted as evidence that BAWP utilizes only one type of leadership activity nor only the most outspoken and assertive individuals. Personal observations made clear that individuals with very different personalities and leadership styles were included in the summer training.

The distinction between recognizing accomplished leaders and training individuals with leadership abilities becomes particularly important to recognize when the BAWP model is disseminated. Other writing projects need to realize that the Invitational model alone may not be adequate to provide

leadership training. The experience of at least one of the other National Writing Project sites to deliberately include teachers who do not have proven leadership ability, suggests that it may not be necessary to rely solely on proven leaders. This discussion is in no way meant to suggest that the model could not accomodate inclusion of more specific leadership training, but rather to note that up to the present time, it has not. In fact, BAWP's choice results from awareness of the limited time in the summer program and their decision to devote it entirely to participants' presentations and writing, and to talks by experts in the field.

One final area of impact on teachers demonstrates more predictable effects of BAWP training. Both BAWP groups reported their inservice training as having a greater influence on course content than did the Comparison teachers. Thus despite the very high level of inservice activity reported by the Comparison group (91% indicated some inservice training in 1978), the group did not find it to be a significant influence on content. Among Inservice teachers relative to Comparison teachers, the only other factor to achieve a significant influence on content was "fellow colleagues." This seems consistent with 1977 data in which the Inservice group reported a higher percent of shared planning with individual peers and no instances of "no regular shared planning", suggesting that perhaps by chance these teachers have more compatible and cooperative colleagues.

Thus despite the small number of statistically significant changes observed (compared to the total number of practices measured) BAWP teachers believed BAWP training to be very influential on classroom content. This finding seems particularly important considering the widespread dissatisfaction with many inservice programs reported in a recent nationwide study (Joyce, 1977) as well as comparatively lower levels of satisfaction reported

for many individual inservices.[13] Furthermore, the RAND study found that a sense of efficacy, a belief that teachers can make a difference, correlated most highly with teacher change.[14] If BAWP, using teachers as consultants and Inservice presenters, creates the impression that teachers can and have made a difference in the classroom, it may help promote and inculcate a belief in teacher efficacy. The actual degree of change in teacher behavior needed to bring a measurable improvement in student writing skills, however, remains a question worthy of future consideration.

Uniqueness of BAWP--Promising Practices of Comparison Teachers

Another success of BAWP can be understood after examining the teaching practices of both Comparison and BAWP teachers. Because the practices common to both groups far outnumbered those unique to BAWP, the Writing Project's goal of incorporating promising methods from a variety of sources seems to have been achieved. (See Table 12 for a complete list of these practices.) No single method or specific approach was found to be in widespread use by the Comparison group that was not also being used by BAWP teachers. Obviously, however, a given technique can be used differently by individual teachers. Thus BAWP-trained teachers may uniquely use certain techniques; the interview questionnaire may not have identified such distinctions. Such a subtle area of examination requires more sensitive measures than teacher self-report.

Some BAWP emphases already noted (prewriting, revision, and small group work) have fairly consistent support in educational research as being valuable for improving student writing.[15] In our examination of the correlations between teaching practices and student writing performance, none of the factors teachers believed especially important for improving student writing achieved statistical significance (See Appendix E for a list of these and The

Writing Report for details). Thus it might mean that a more sensitive assessment tool is needed for identifying changes in student writing performance resulting from BAWP or other high school writing programs. Some of these student changes might best be examined in the more controlled methodological studies being undertaken by BAWP and the Evaluation Staff during 1978-1979.

Research on the Effectiveness of Inservice Training

Does research on changing teacher behavior as a result of training offer a broader perspective in which to view the impact of BAWP? Unfortunately, little research has been done that provides an answer to that question. As one recent national survey of inservice activities concluded, much more careful study of the effectiveness of inservice training is required.[16] The RAND Report (1977) provides an overall context for viewing teacher change. One area of particular interest is extent of use of new materials. As reported, 76% of the teachers surveyed indicated use of new project materials to a large extent. A smaller number (51%) reported that they had tried some project methods. Because BAWP does not offer packages of materials, but rather a variety of methods and suggestions for implementing them, it is attempting to modify that aspect of teacher behavior which seems more resistant to change. However, in light of the RAND findings, the report that all of the BAWP Inservice teachers surveyed had tried 3 or more of BAWP methods seems noteworthy. More impressively, all Invitational teachers reported trying at least 5 or more of the techniques presented to them during the Invitational program. Clearly BAWP is affecting its participants.

Another interesting result was found in a study of the Kansas Right to Read Program, 1973-1974.[17] Teachers reported slight increases in the use of the techniques emphasized in their training. Group means increased from 2% to 19% over a list of 17 items. The most important effect reported, however, was on attitudes. Almost all the participants reported in open-ended questions that the greatest benefit of the training was the "confidence, enthusiasm, awareness, and sharing" generated by the workshop. These teachers, along with those in the BAWP training rate an increased sense of teacher efficacy as the most important result of inservice training.

One of the few writing inservices to be evaluated in recent years, the Albion New York Writing Project, did not quantify its results, but rather expressed findings in terms of concepts that the participants had initially found difficult to accept, but had later discovered to be of most importance.[18] The authors concluded that changing writing attitudes and habits, for both staff and students is a process which requires a long period of time and repeated practice. Thus measuring short-term change may be a misleading indicator of the total impact of a writing program.

Studies in other subject areas, such as science and mathematics which are based on more precisely-defined curricula and measurable student outcomes offer only limited comparisons to writing curriculum. One NSF biology institute reported that participants, measured a year after their training, had increased their teaching emphasis on 45 topics out of the total of 55 covered in the institute.[19] These were related directly to biology curriculum units and agreed upon as important aspects of the courses being taught. Another cooperative program for junior college science teachers, designed to promote the use of individualized instruction modules, reported that only 33% of the participants changed their curriculum "substantially" as a result of the

training, while another 50% made "some" changes.[20] In clearly defined curricula with specific objectives, it may be easier for teachers to adopt new strategies. In more diffuse areas in which both content and methodology are being tested and implemented, one could not expect the same high level of adoption. Despite the limitations in these research findings, one can conclude that BAWP has taken on one of the most difficult types of training tasks and has done a creditable job in attempting to achieve its goals.

TABLES

TABLE 1

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT ITEMS (at $p \leq .05$)

ITEM	GROUP	N	MEAN, %	TEST
I. INVITATIONAL GROUP				
1977 :				
1. More hours writing per week not required for job.	Invitational Inservice	12 11	3.4 2.3	T
2. Greater use of peer feedback	Invitational Comparison	12 23	See Table 9	MWU* WRS
1978 :				
1a. Larger total number of pre-writing exercises taught	Invitational Comparison	12 23	3.92 2.43	T
1b. Specific prewriting techniques:				
a. Larger number using idea diagramming	Invitational Comparison	12 23	50% 13%	X^2
b. More teachers using "other" exercises	Invitational Comparison	12 23	50% 13%	X^2
c. More teachers using free writing	Invitational Control	12 23	68% 26%	X^2
2. More teachers teaching writing for different audiences	Invitational Comparison	12 23	92% 48%	X^2
3. Larger % providing time for re-writing in class (often or nearly always)	Invitational Comparison	12 22	92% 36%	MWU* WRS
4a. Gain in % teaching mechanics using exercises & workbooks	'78 Invitational '77 Invitational	12 12	34% 9%	McNemar
4b. Larger % teaching mechanics using workbooks/textbooks	Invitational Inservice	12 11	8% 7%	T
4c. Decrease, 1977-1978 in use of whole discourses within group	'78 Invitational '77 Invitational	12 12	56.82 81.25	T
4d. Increase, 1977-1978 in use of "Other exercises" to teach mechanics	'78 Invitational '77 Invitational	12 12	14.09 9.55	T
5. Lower % time devoted to academic writing	Invitational Comparison	12 23	63% 83%	T

*MWU/WRS = Mann Whitney U : Wilcoxin Rank Sum

6. Larger % using peer feedback	Invitational Comparison Inservice	12 23 8	-- -- --	MWU-WRS* MWU-WRS* MWU-WRS
7. Larger % claiming inservice as "some" or "a great deal" of influence on class content	Invitational Comparison	12 23	50% 22%	MWU* WRS

II. INSERVICE GROUP

1977 :

1. More years teaching experience	Inservice Invitational	10 12	See Table 2	MWU* WRS
2. Larger average number of students in class tested	Inservice Comparison	10 18	29.7 24.1	T
3. Larger total number of students	Inservice Invitational	10 11	128.7 94.8	T
4. Larger % teaching mechanics using workbooks	Inservice Invitational	10 12	34% 9%	T

1978 :

1. Larger number of techniques teaching prewriting	Inservice Comparison	11 23	5.27 3.87	T
2. Larger % of writing that can be completed in class	Inservice Comparison	11 23	76% 49%	MWU* WRS
3a. Within group gain in % using peer feedback	'78 Inservice '77 Inservice	10 11	See Table 9	--
3b. Larger % using peer feedback	Inservice Comparison	10 23	See Table 9	MWU* WRS
4a. Larger % using whole discourses to teach mechanics	Inservice Comparison	10 21	73% 43%	T
4b. Within group gain in % using whole discourses to teach mechanics, 1977-1978	Inservice Comparison	5 16	22% 34%	T
5a. Within group gain in % of time spent teaching academic writing	'78 Inservice '77 Inservice	8 11	76% 58%	T
5b. Greater within group decrease in % time spent teaching practical/social writing	'78 Inservice '77 Inservice	8 11	4% 21%	T
6. Greater use of lay readers	Comparison Invitational	23 12	See Appendices B, C	T

7. Larger % teaching precis	Inservice Comparison	10 23	36% 17%	McNemar
8a. Larger % claiming colleagues signif. (i.e. as some or a great deal of) influence on course content	Inservice Invitational	10 12	91% 42%	MWU* WRS
8b. Larger % claiming inservice as important (i.e. as some or a great deal of) influence on class content	Inservice Comparison	10 23	100% 22%	MUW* WRS
9. Decrease in number of individual skills teaching mechanics (i.e. decrease in group mean or mechanics cluster)	'78 Inservice '77 Inservice	11 11	2.9 4.3	T
10. Decrease in total students	'78 Inservice '77 Inservice	10 10	118.6 127.7	T
11. Larger number of students in class tested	Inservice Invitational Comparison	11 12 23	27.3 20.8 22.8	T
12. Fewer students going on to a 4-year college	Inservice Invitational	11 12	26.6 61.4	ANOVA

III. COMPARISON GROUP

1977 :

1. Larger number using exercises/ workbooks to teach mechanics	Comparison Invitational	22 12	27% 9%	T
2. Larger number of techniques teaching expository writing	Comparison Invitational	23 12	6.5 4.9	T

1978 :

1a. Decrease in % time teaching personal writing	'78 Comparison '77 Comparison	23 22	12% 25%	T
1b. Decrease in % time teaching practical/social writing	'78 Comparison '77 Comparison	22 22	3% 13%	T
1c. Within group gain in % time devoted to academic writing	'78 Comparison '77 Comparison	22 22	85% 63%	T
1d. Greater % time devoted to academic writing	Comparison Invitational	23 12	83% 63%	T

2a. Increase in % time teaching mechanics using exercises/ workbooks	'78 Comparison '77 Comparison	23 20	46% 26%	T
2b. Increase in % time teaching mechanics using "other" activities	'78 Comparison '77 Comparison	23 22	11% 3%	T
2c. Decrease in % time teaching mechanics using whole discourses	'78 Comparison '77 Comparison	23 20	42% 69%	T

Table 2 : Teacher Characteristics

A. Age :	BAWP Invitational	Comparison	BAWP Inservice
25 and under	-	-	-
26-35	50%	27%	-
36-45	25%	32%	55%
46-55	25%	27%	27%
56 and over	-	14%	18%
	N = 12	22	11

B. Level of education attained :	BAWP Invitational	Comparison	BAWP Inservice
BA + fewer than 20 units (semester hours)	-	4%	-
BA + 20-40 units	41%	4%	20%
MA or MAT + fewer than 20 units OR BA + 41 or more units	17%	30%	10%
MA or MAT + more than 20 graduate or in-service units	42%	57%	70%
Ed.D., Ph.D., or other degree past MA	-	9%	-
	N = 12	23	10

C. Years of teaching experience :	BAWP Invitational	Comparison	BAWP Inservice
5 years or less	-	-	-
6-10 years	41%	17%	-
11-15 years	17%	39%	18%
16-20 years	42%	9%	55%
over 20 years	-	35%	27%
	N = 12	23	11

Table 3 : Percent of Teachers Involved in Inservice and Consulting

	BAWP Invitational	Comparison	BAWP Inservice
Inservice Training :	42%	78%	82%
Consulting Activities :	33%	22%	27%
	N = 12	23	11

Table 4 : 1977 Hours Writing (Per Week) Not required for the Job

Hours Writing	BAWP Invitational	Comparison	BAWP Inservice
0-2	58%	57%	90%
3-5	25%	13%	-
over 5	17%	17%	10%
	N = 12	22	11

Table 5 : Self-reported Measures of Teacher Work-Load :

	BAWP Invitational		Comparison		BAWP Inservice	
	1977	1978	1977	1978	1977	1978
1. Average # of classes	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3
2. Average # of unpaid duties	1.9	2.3	1.2	1.9	1.6	1.3
3. Average # of total students	94.8	101.8	113.9	119.4	128.7	118.6
4. Average # of students in classes tested	27.1	21.4	24.1	22.9	29.7	27.3
N =	11	12	18	23	10	10

Table 6 : Characteristics of English Departments :

	BAWP Invitational	Comparison	BAWP Inservice
1. Department morale*	2.3	2.5	2.9
2. Usefulness of department meetings *	2.0	2.1	2.3
3. Shared planning			
a. Whole department	33%	70%	40%
b. Individual peers	50%	17%	60%
c. "No" regular shared planning	17%	13%	-
N =	12	23	11

* Responses represent a group mean score on a 3-point scale where :

1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = good

Table 7 : Teaching of Mechanics :

Percent of Time Teachers Devoted to Various Writing Techniques

	Exercises/ Workbooks*		Whole Discourses		Other Techniques	
	1977	1978	1977	1978	1977	1978
BAWP Invitational Teachers (N=12)	9%	25%* 8%	81%	57%	10%	14%
Comparison Teachers (N=23)	27%	34% 11%	68%	42%	3%	11%
BAWP Inservice Teachers (N=11)	34%	18% 7%	58%	66%	8%	10%

* In 1978, exercises and workbooks were rated separately; in this table percent of use of exercises is listed above that of workbooks.

Table 8 : Mean 5 Time Spent Writing for :

	Personal Growth		Academic Success		Practical/ Social Success	
	1977	1978	1977	1978	1977	1978
BAWP Invitational Taachers (N=12)	28%	25%	58%	63%	15%	12%
Comparison Teachers (N=23)	25%	12%	59%	83%	13%	5%
BAWP Inservice Teachers (N=11)	19%	21%	58%	74%	21%	6%

Table 9 : Frequency of Use of Peer Grading or Peer Feedback in the Class Tested :

(Percent Responding "YES")

1977 *

	BAWP Invitational	Comparison	BAWP Inservice
1. Have used in past, but infrequently	17%	52%	50%
2. Use occasionally in present	17%	35%	10%
3. Use frequently, it's an important part of my program	67%	13%	40%
N =	12	23	10

1978

	BAWP Invitational	Comparison	BAWP Inservice
1. Never	-	39%	11%
2. Occasionally (2-3 times a term)	25%	48%	67%
3. Weekly, or every assignment	75%	13%	22%
N -	12	23	11

* For ease of statistical comparison with the 1978 items, the 1977 responses were renumbered so that responses to "1" (used in past) were dropped, and a blank response which indicated no use of peer feecback = 1 (never).

Table 10 : 1978 Average Hours of Teacher Writing Rime Per/Week :

	BAWP Invitational	Comparison	BAWP Inservice
a. Doing assignments with students	2.9	3.7	2.0
b. Preparing curriculum materials	5.0	9.1	5.4
c. Personal creative writing	2.1	.9	.8
d. Other personal writing	1.7	1.3	.7
	N = 12	23	11

Table 11 : Percent of Individual Teachers Reporting Inservice or Consulting Activity

	BAWP Invitational		Comparison		BAWP Inservice	
	1977	1978	1977	1978	1977	1978
Inservice (excluding BAWP training	42%	42%	78%	91%	36%	
Consulting and Leadership	33%	83%	22%	65%	27%	27%
N =	12	12	23	23	11	11

TABLE 12

Promising Practices Used by Both BAWP and Comparison Teachers **

1977	1978
a. 2-5 pages of writing assigned weekly *	a. 3 or more pages of writing weekly*
b. use of whole discourses to teach mechanics	b. use of whole discourses to teach mechanics
c. emphasis on academic writing (over 50% of writing time spent on it)	c. emphasis on academic writing
d. teaching the following mechanics: correct usage* punctuation* spelling diction* syntax*	d. teaching the following mechanics : punctuation diction syntax
e. point of view*	e. different points of view
f. concreteness*	f. concrete details
g. descriptive writing*	g. descriptive writing
h. narrative writing*	h. personal essay
i. paragraph development	i. paragraph development*
j. thesis writing*	j. thesis statement*
k. conclusion*	k. logic
l. logic*	l. persuasion/argument*
m. transitional devices*	m. literary criticism
n. logical argument*	n. essay organization
	NB. The following items appeared only in the 1978 interview :
	o. prewriting techniques of teacher-led discussion and special stimuli (slides, etc.)
	p. allowing time in class for prewriting often or nearly always*
	q. encouraging rewriting often or nearly always*
	r. preceding revision with written comments or individual conferences*
	s. writing for different purposes*
	t. modeling or imitation of styles/forms
	u. sentence combining

** All the items listed were used by at least 50% of the Comparison group and one or both of the BAWP-trained groups.

* Indicates use by at least 75% of the Comparison group and one or both of the BAWP-trained groups.

Footnotes

[1]Berman, P., Mc Iaughlin, M., Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change : Vol. VII: Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation, Rand, 1977.

[2]See Summer Invitational Report, by Catherine Keech, for more complete details.

[3]Ibid.

[4]See Report on the Writing Assessment, October, 1978, for a more complete description of testing and interviewing procedures.

[5]See Nancy Roark, Inservice Report, Section 2 for detailed comparison.

[6]Berman, P., McIaughlin, M., ibid.

[7]Ibid.

[8]See Appendix D for a complete list of presentations in the Inservices whose participants were tested and interviewed. Keech, C., 1977 Invitational, lists summer presentations.

[9]See Roark, Inservice Report, Section 2, for discussion of goals of BAWP training.

[10]Roark, Inservice Report, found (using ANOVA) that those who had used BAWP-emphasized techniques prior to the Inservice training were not significantly different in most ratings of effects of training from those teachers who lacked prior experience.

[11]See Roark, Inservice Report, Section 4, for a discussion of reported effects of the Inservices.

[12]Interestingly, this type had negative correlation with performance on both essays in 1977, with the expository essay in 1978, and a negative correlation in both years with overall test performance.

[13]Roark reports similar enthusiasm among the larger group of Inservice participants who rated their training on a 4-point scale.

[14]Berman, Factors Affecting Implementation, p. 19.

[15]On small group work see Tom Hawkins, Group Inquiry Techniques for Teaching Writing, NCTE, 1976; for prewriting see Janet Emig, The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders, NCTE, 1971; for revising see Betty Bamberg, "Composition Instruction Does Make a Difference", Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. XII, No. 1, 1978.

[16]See Alexander Nicholson, Bruce Joyce, Donald Parker, Floyd Waterrman, Literature on ISTE (Inservice Teacher Education), Report III, National Dissemination Center of Syracusee Univ., 1976.

[17] Shirley, Don D., Kansas Right-to-Read Project Program Evaluation, 1973-74, September 1974, ERIC ED 096 628.

[18] Blake, Robert W. Tuttle, Frederick B., Jr., Composing as the Curriculum: The Albion Writing Project, State University of New York College at Brockport, ERIC ED 196 590.

[19] Hendren, J., Mertens, I., Nisbet, J., "A Study of an NSF Institute", American Biology Teacher, Vol. 35, 9, pp. 510-519.

[20] Rosen, Marvin J.; Cohen, Arthur M., An Evaluative Study of the University of California, Irvine/ Golden West College Cooperative Science Improvement Project, Los Angeles, Calif., June 1972, ERIC ED 092 325.

APPENDICES : INTERVIEW REPORT

A. List of Class Names : Classes tested from all three groups, 1977-1978

B. 1977 Interviews : Descriptive Statistics

C. 1978 Interviews : Descriptive Statistics

D. 1977, 1978 Mechanics, Expressive, and Expository Clusters

E. Correlations of Teaching Practices and Student Writing Performance, 1977, 1978

F_1 Inservice Presentations by Title or Content

F_2 Distribution of 1977-1978 Teacher Consultants and Staff by Institute Year

G. Different Types of Writing

H. Factors Affecting Success in Writing

APPENDIX A
LIST OF CLASS NAMES

SCHOOL CODE	TEACHER CODE	1977 : CLASS TITLE (grade level)	1978 : CLASS TITLE (grade level)
Group 01 : BAWP Summer Invitational (Spring 1977, Spring 1978 Testing)			
03	05	Adv. Comp. (11-12)*	Adv. Comp (11-12) Creative Writing (9-12)
04	07	English Activities (9) Satire & Humor (9-11)	English I (9) Satire & Humor (10)
02	02	A.P. English (12)	A.P. English (12)
12	26	A.P. English (12) Soph. Honors (10) English - R (10)	A.P. English (12) Soph. Honors (10) English 2 (10)
11	25	Writing Workshop (9-12) Creative Writing (10-12)	Writing Workshop (9-12) Creative Writing (10-11)
01	01	A.P. English (12)	A.P. English (12)
13	27	Adv. Writing (11-12) Calif. Literature (11-12)	Adv. Writing (11-12) Calif. Literature (11-12)
10	24	Writing SAT (11-12)	Writing SAT (11)
Group 02 : BAWP Inservice (Spring 1977, Spring 1978 Testing)			
20	44	English (10-11)	Literature : Twain, Huxley, Orwell (11-12)
21	48	English (11)	English 5-6 (11)
23	53	English Review (11-12)	
Group 03 : Control Group (Spring 1977, Spring 1978 Testing)			
17	36	College Prep. Sr. (12)	World Literature (11-12)
17	37	College Prep 10th (10)	Soph. A-Lane English (10)
17	38	Senior Comp. (12)	Senior Comp. (Engl. 53) (12)
06	11	Expository Writing (11-12)	Expository Writing (11-12)
06	13	Expository Writing (11-12)	Expository Writing (11-12)

* When students of a special grade level comprise 5% or more of the class tested, that grade level will be listed.

(List of Class Names, Group 03, cont.):

SCHOOL CODE	TEACHER CODE	1977 : CLASS TITLE (grade level)	1978 : CLASS TITLE (grade level)
09	22	Adv. Comp. (11-12)	Adv. Comp. (11-12)
09	23	Comp. : Non-Fiction (9-11)	Comp.: Non-Fiction (10-12)
19	41	Gods, Graves & Scholars (11-12)	Mythology (11-12)
19	42	Soph. English Honors (10)	A.P. English (12)
19	43	Adv. Comp. (12)	English 2 (10)
15	30	Phil/Logic/Comp. (11-12)	Phil/Logic/Comp. (11-12)
15	32	Adv. Stand. English 2 (10)	Adv. Stand. English 2 (10)
15	33	Jr. English (Adv) (11)	Jr. English (Adv.) (11)
16	35	Comp. (11-12)	Comp. (11-12)
07	14	American Literature (11)	American Literature (11)
07	15	College Prep English (11)	College Prep English (11)
07	16	Creative Writing (11)	Creative Writing (12)
07	17		
07	18	College Prep English (11)	College Prep English (11)
05	08	A.P. English (12)	A.P. English (12)
05	09	Adv. Comp. (12)	9th English (9) English Literature (11-12)
05	10	Comedy & Satire (11-12)	Humanities (11-12) Film (11-12)

Group 04 : BAWP Summer Invitational (Fall 1977, Spring 1978 Testing)

24	55	Adv. Comp. (12)	British Literature (12)
25	56	English 10, ESEA (10) English 10 (10)	English 10, ESEA (10) English 10 (10) English 11-12 (11-12)
25	57	Sr. Studies (12)	Sr. Studies (12)
26	58	Expository Writing (10-12) Sr. Literature (12)	Expository Writing (10-11) Sr. Short Story (12)

Group 05 : BAWP Inservice (Fall 1977, Spring 1978 Testing)

30	74	Adv. Rhetoric (12)	Adv. Rhetoric (12)
30	75	Introduction to Comp. (10-11)	Mythology (10-11)
30	76	Intermediate Comp. (10)	American Novel, Dream (9-12)

(List of Class Names, Group 05, cont.) :

SCHOOL CODE	TEACHER CODE	1977 : CLASS TITLE (grade level)	1978 : CLASS TITLE (grade level)
27	60	Composition 4 (12)	Composition 4 (12)
27	64	Composition 3 (10-11)	Composition 3 (10-11)
29	70	English IV C (12) English III A (11-12)	English IV C (12) English III A (11)
29	71	English IV C (12)	English IV C (12)
29	72	English III A (11-12)	English III A (11)

Group 10 : Control Group (Fall 1977, Spring 1978 Testing)

34	91	Sr. Comp. (12)	Sr. Comp. (12) 10th English (10)

APPENDIX B
1977 INTERVIEWS

Q. 1. Estimated hours spent doing writing not required for job in the last week :

	INV*	COMP*	INS*
- None	8.3	17.4	30.0
- Some, but less than 1 hour		8.7	30.0
- 1-2 hours	50.0	30.4	30.0
- 3-5 hours	25.0	26.6	4.6
- over 5 hours	16.7	17.4	10.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 2. Classes Grouped by Content or Ability Level :

	INV	COMP	INS
1. English langauge arts	8.3	17.4	30.0
2. Composition	16.7	17.4	60.0
3. Writing by Genre	16.7	21.7	
4. Literature or writing (by ability level)	41.7	30.4	10.0
5. Literature	8.3	13.0	
6. Other	8.3		
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 3. Length of Classes :

	INV	COMP	INS
1. Year	41.7	39.1	20.0
2. Semester	58.3	60.9	80.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 4. Grade Level :

	INV	COMP	INS
1. 11th & 12th	36.4	45.5	30.0
2. 10th-12th	9.1	4.5	30.0
3. 10th-11th			10.0
4. 9th (+ other)		4.5	
5. 10th	9.1	13.6	
6. 11th		13.6	10.0
7. 12th	45.5	18.2	20.0
NUMBER :	11	22	10

* INV = Summer Invitational Group, COMP = Comparison Group, INS = BAWP Inservice Group.

Q. 5. Compared to students of the same grade level in previous years, this class, in verbal ability seems :

	INV	COMP	INS
- less talented	16.7	21.7	
- about the same	58.3	52.2	80.0
- unusually talented	25.0	26.1	20.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 6. Compared to students of the same grade level in previous years, this class, in preparation in mechanics of writing seems :

	INV	COMP	INS
- less well-prepared	8.3	22.7	
- about the same	75.0	68.2	80.0
- better prepared	16.7	9.1	20.0
NUMBER :	12	22	10

Q. 7. Your enjoyment of this class, either for personal or professional reasons, has been :

	INV	COMP	INS
- lower	33.3	26.1	20.0
- about the same	16.7	52.2	50.0
- greater than usual	50.0	21.7	30.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 8. Percent of new approaches, materials &/or methods used in this class :

	INV	COMP	INS
- 0-20%	16.7	27.3	
- 21-40%	41.7	40.9	50.0
- 41-60%	33.3	13.6	20.0
- 61-80%		4.5	10.0
- 81-100%	8.3	13.6	20.0
NUMBER :	12	22	10

Q. 9. Average amount of writing assigned in this class per week :

	INV	COMP	INS
- 2-5 pages	66.7	77.3	90.0
- more than 5 pages	33.3	22.7	10.0
NUMBER :	12	22	10

Q. 10. Average number of hours spent reading students' work from all classes per week:

	INV	COMP	INS
- 2-5	9.1	9.1	10.0
- 6-10	45.5	31.8	30.0
- 11-15	45.5	9.1	
- over 15		50.0	30.0
NUMBER :	11	22	10

Q. 11. Frequency of use of peer feedback in this class :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Have used in class but infrequently.	16.7	52.2	50.0
- Use occasionally in present.	16.7	34.8	10.0
- Use frequently, it is an important part of my program.	66.7	13.0	40.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 12. Mean percent of teachers using lay-readers :

	INV	COMP	INS
	8.3	26.1	30.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 13. In teaching mechanics, what proportion of use do you make of each of the following ?

	INV	COMP	INS
- exercises, workbooks	9.2	27.2	34.0
- whole student discourses	81.3	68.4	68.0
- other	9.6	3.4	1.0
NUMBER :	12	22	10

Q. 14. Out of their total time spent writing during the term, students spend approximately the following percentages on these three types of writing :

	INV	COMP	INS
1. Type One : Leads to the creation of literary art.	27.5	24.9	19.4
2. Type Two : Leads to mastery of forms of academic discussion.	58.0	59.1	58.1
3 3. Type Three : Leads to use of writing in business, vocational, social, civic situations.	14.5	13.3	21.3
NUMBER :	10	22	8

APPENDIX C
1978 INTERVIEWS

Q. 1. Names of Classes Grouped by Content or Ability Level :

	INV*	COMP*	INS*
1. English language arts	8.3	30.4	30.0
2. Composition		13.0	40.0
3. Writing by Genre	16.7	21.7	
4. Literature or writing (by ability level)	50.0	17.4	10.0
5. Literature	16.7	17.4	20.0
6. Other	8.3		
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 2. Length of Classes :

	INV	COMP	INS
1. Year	41.7	43.5	
2. Semester	58.3	56.5	100
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 3. Grade Level :

	INV	COMP	INS
1. 11th & 12th	16.7	34.8	10.0
2. 10th-12th	16.7	8.7	20.0
3. 10th-11th	8.3		20.0
4. 9th (+ other)		4.3	10.0
5. 10th	8.3	17.4	
6. 11th	8.3	17.4	10.0
7. 12th	41.7	17.4	30.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 4. Compared to students of the same grade level in previous years, this class, in verbal ability seems :

	INV	COMP	INS
- less talented	33.3	34.8	27.3
- about the same	50.0	65.2	63.6
- unusually talented	16.7		9.1
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 5. Compared to students of the same grade level in previous years, this class, in preparation in mechanics of writing seems :

	INV	COMP	INS
- less well-prepared	16.7	30.4	10.0
- about the same	58.3	47.8	70.0
- better prepared	25.0	21.7	20.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

* INV = Summer Invitational Group, COMP = Comparison Group, INS = BAWP Inservice Group.

Q. 6. Compared to students of the same grade level in previous years, this class, in motivation & effort seems :

	INV	COMP	INS
- lower	16.7	28.6	20.0
- about the same	41.7	38.1	60.0
- better than usual	41.7	33.3	20.0
NUMBER :	12	21	11

Q. 7. Your enjoyment of this class, either for personal or professional reasons, has been :

	INV	COMP	INS
- lower	16.7	21.7	18.2
- about the same	33.3	43.5	36.4
- greater than usual	50.0	34.8	45.5
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 8. Entry Level Skills : Estimate the percentages of students who could do the following before entering your class:

	INV	COMP	INS
- complete sentences	78.25	79.57	80.0
- organized paragraphs	59.17	56.96	52.73
- organized essays of 5 paragraphs	55.0	44.57	29.36
- creative writing	50.42	35.04	35.10
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 9. Students' Future Goals : Estimate in percentages what you expect the students in this class to do after graduation :

	INV	COMP	INS
- 4 year college	56.58	47.26	27.82
- 2 year college	30.48	33.91	45.56
- vocational training	6.67	10.22	16.82
- military	6.83	2.48	4.09
- married	10.83	11.88	11.89
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 10. Percent of new approaches, materials &/or methods used in this class :

	INV	COMP	INS
- 0-20%	8.3	4.3	9.1
- 21-40%	41.7	82.6	54.5
- 41-60%	50.0	8.7	27.3
- 61-80%		4.3	9.1
- 81-100%			
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 11. Average amount of writing assigned in this class per week :

	INV	COMP	INS
- less than 1 page	16.7		
- 1 to 2 pages	8.3	21.7	40.0
- 3 to 4 pages	41.7	69.6	40.0
- more than 4	33.3	8.7	20.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

Q. 12. Percent of average weekly writing completed in class time :

	INV	COMP	INS
	56.25	49.39	76.35
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 13. Average number of hours spent reading students' work from this class per week:

	INV	COMP	INS
- less than 2	50.0	40.9	63.6
- 2 to 5	25.0	31.8	18.2
- 6 to 10	25.0	13.6	
- 11 to 15		13.6	18.2
- over 15			
NUMBER :	12	22	11

Q. 14. Mean percent of teachers using lay readers :

	INV	COMP	INS
	16.7	43.5	81.8
NUMBER:	12	23	11

Q. 15. In teaching mechanics, what proportion of use do you make of each of the following:

	INV	COMP	INS
- exercises, worksheets	25.5	34.1	17.7
- workbooks, textbooks	8.2	11.5	6.8
- whole student discourses	56.8	43.2	65.5
- other	9.5	11.2	10.0
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 16. Out of their total time spent writing during the term, students spend approximately the following percentages on these three types of writing :

	INV	COMP	INS
1. Writing for personal pleasure & growth (creative writing, ungraded writing, etc.)	24.9	11.8	20.9
2. Writing for success in school (formal essays, literary criticism, report writing, etc.)	62.9	83.2	72.7
3. Writing for practical purposes (business letters, advertisements, applications, etc.)	12.2	4.8	6.4
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 17. Frequency of use of peer feedback:

	INV	COMP	INS
- Never		39.1	11.1
- Occasionally	25.0	47.8	66.7
- Frequently	75.0	13.0	22.2
NUMBER :	12	23	9

Q. 18. Purposes of peer feedback groups :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Preparation (used prior to writing)	66.7	34.8	36.4
- Use of students as intended audience	83.3	43.5	72.7
- Follow-up	33.3	13.0	18.2
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 19. Mean percent using these prewriting activities :

	INV	COMP	INS
a. Journals	33.3	13.0	18.2
b. Free writing (ungraded or unstructured)	66.7	26.1	27.3
c. Focused free writing	50.0	30.4	45.5
d. Brainstorming	58.3	39.1	81.8
e. Teacher-led discussion	75.0	87.0	100.0
f. Outlining	33.3	56.5	45.5
g. Idea diagramming (mapping)	50.0	13.0	36.4
h. Special stimuli for wirting (slides, etc.)	41.7	56.5	81.8
i. Special exercises	41.7	52.2	54.5
j. Other	50.0	13.0	36.4
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 20. Do you allow time for prewriting activities in class :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Never		4.3	
- Seldom	16.7	4.3	
- Often	50.0	34.8	54.5
- Nearly always	33.3	56.5	45.5
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 21. Do you encourage rewriting or revision?

	INV	COMP	INS
- Never			
- Seldom		17.4	27.3
- Often	33.3	34.8	36.4
- Nearly always	66.7	47.8	36.4
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 22. Do you provide time in class for revision activities?

	INV	COMP	INS
- Never		31.8	18.2
- Seldom	8.3	31.8	36.4
- Often	66.7	18.2	27.3
- Nearly always	25.0	18.2	18.2
NUMBER :	12	22	11

Q. 23. What type of feedback do you provide students prior to their revisions ?

	INV	COMP	INS
- Written comments	72.7	82.6	72.7
- Individual conferences	72.7	78.3	72.7
NUMBER :	11	23	11

Q. 24. In teaching the expository essay, have you given instruction in any of the following ?

Mean percent of teachers answering YES :

	INV	COMP	INS
1. Methods of paragraph development	83.3	91.3	100.0
2. Methods of developing the thesis statement	58.3	91.3	81.8
3. Essay organization	50.0	47.8	45.5
4. Critical thinking methods :			
a. Logic	58.3	60.9	45.5
b. Thinking fallacies	41.7	21.7	45.5
c. Rhetorical persuasion	50.0	30.4	63.6
d. Precis writing	16.7	17.4	36.4

Q. 25. Mean percent using these writing strategies :

	INV	COMP	INS
a. Writing for different audiences	91.7	47.8	81.2
b. Writing for different purposes	83.3	73.9	100.0
c. Modeling or imitation of forms or styles of writing	66.7	65.2	81.8
d. Use of different points of view, voices or persons	66.7	60.9	63.6
e. Use of concrete & general details (showing not telling)	91.7	82.6	100.0
f. Sentence combining, cumulative sentences	41.7	65.2	72.7
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 26. Mean percent of the final course grade that grades on writing assignments comprise :

	INVITATIONAL	COMPARISON	INSERVICE
	73.25	68.70	72.09
NUMBER:	12	23	11

Q. 27. Mean percent teaching these modes or genres :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Descriptive	75.0	69.6	45.5
- Narrative	66.7	47.8	54.5
- Dramatic	33.3	21.7	27.3
- Poetic	41.7	26.1	27.3
- Personal essay	83.3	69.6	100.0
- Creative prose	58.3	39.1	36.4
- Literary criticism	75.0	60.9	63.6
- Persuasion/argument	66.7	87.0	81.8
- Practical, social	41.7	17.4	36.4
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 28. Mean percent teaching these mechanical skills :

	INV	COMP.	INS
- Punctuation, capitalization	66.7	52.2	45.5
- Spelling	66.7	26.1	36.4
- Diction, vocabulary development	41.7	82.6	63.6
- Syntax	41.7	65.2	63.6
- Other items of grammar & usage	50.0	34.8	54.5
- Stylistic devices	58.3	47.8	81.8
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 29. To what extent has course content in the class being tested been dictated by outside factors : (departmental policy, available books & supplies, etc)

	INV	COMP	INS
a. Not at all	50.0	13.0	
b. Very little	8.3	34.8	45.5
c. Somewhat	25.0	26.1	27.3
d. Almost entirely	16.7	21.7	27.3
NUMBER :	12	23	11

Q. 30. Influences on course content : Have any of the following influenced your course content ?

a. Colleagues in school district :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Not at all	50.0	21.7	
- Very little	8.3	13.0	9.1
- Some	25.0	47.8	27.3
- A great deal	16.7	17.4	63.6

b. In-Service training :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Not at all	16.7	47.8	
- Very little	33.3	30.4	
- Some	33.3	13.0	72.7
- a great deal	16.7	8.7	27.3

c. Courses or other professional training :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Not at all	8.3	26.1	9.1
- Very little	8.3	13.0	9.1
- Some	41.7	39.1	36.4
- A great deal	41.7	21.7	45.5

d. Professional conferences or workshops :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Not at all	16.7	26.1	36.4
- Very little	8.3	17.4	9.1
- Some	41.7	43.5	36.4
- A great deal	33.3	13.0	18.2

e. Professional journals, outside reading :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Not at all	25.0	17.4	9.1
- Very little	16.7	26.1	27.3
- Some	41.7	43.5	54.5
- A great deal	16.7	13.0	9.1

f. Students' response to assignments :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Not at all		4.3	
- Very little	8.3		9.1
- Some	33.3	43.5	36.4
- A great deal	58.3	52.2	54.5

g. Your own analysis of student work :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Not at all			9.1
- Very little		4.3	
- Some	25.0	21.7	27.3
- A great deal	75.0	73.9	63.6

h. Own writing or personal experiences :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Not at all			
- Very little		13.0	18.2
- Some	41.7	56.5	54.5
- A great deal	50.0	30.4	18.2

* NUMBER for Question 30 :

INV	COMP	INS
12	23	11

63

APPENDIX D

1977 Mechanics, Expressive, and Expository Clusters

Mean Percent of Groups Teaching the Following Items :

a. Mechanics Cluster :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Usage, standard dialect	66.7	87.0	80.0
- Punctuation, capitalization	50.0	87.0	70.0
- Spelling	58.3	56.5	80.0
- Diction, Vocabulary development	75.0	91.3	100.0
- Syntax (run-ons, fragments, etc.)	83.3	91.3	100.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

b. Expository Writing Cluster :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Paragraphing	66.7	91.3	100.0
- Thesis forming*	83.3	100.0	100.0
- Conclusions	75.0	91.3	100.0
- Logic*	75.0	91.3	90.0
- Transitional devices	75.0	95.7	100.0
- Literary criticism*	33.3	52.2	30.0
- Precis*	16.7	26.1	0.0
- Persuasive argument*	33.3	43.5	50.0
- Logical argument*	33.3	60.9	50.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

c. Expressive Writing Cluster :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Point of view*	75.0	95.7	90.0
- Concreteness*	83.3	91.3	100.0
- Journals*	25.0	82.6	12.5
- Description	52.2	52.2	40.0
- Narratives	50.0	52.2	30.0
- Poetry	16.7	30.4	100.0
- Impressionistic writing	41.7	17.4	10.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

* In addition to being analyzed as part of a cluster, these items were matched individually and with appropriate items from the 1978 Interview and analyzed for statistically significant change.

64

APPENDIX D

1978 Mechanics, Expressive, and Expository Clusters

Mean Percent of Groups Teaching the Following Items :

a. Mechanics Cluster :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Usage, standard dialect	50.0	34.8	54.5
- Punctuation, capitalization	66.7	52.2	45.5
- Spelling	66.7	26.1	36.4
- Diction, Vocabulary development	41.7	82.6	63.6
- Syntax (run-ons, fragments, etc.)	41.7	65.2	63.6
NUMBER :	12	23	10

b. Expository Writing Cluster :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Paragraphing	83.3	91.3	100.0
- Thesis forming *	58.3	91.3	81.8
- Conclusions	58.3	60.9	63.6
- Logic *	58.3	60.9	45.9
- Transitional devices	58.3	60.9	63.6
- Literary criticism *	75.0	60.9	63.6
- Precis *	16.7	17.4	63.6
- Persuasive argument *	50.0	30.4	63.6
- Logical argument *	66.7	87.0	81.8
NUMBER :	12	23	10

c. Expressive Writing Cluster :

	INV	COMP	INS
- Point of view *	66.7	65.2	81.2
- Concreteness *	91.7	82.6	100.0
- Journals *	33.3	13.0	18.2
- Description	75.0	69.6	45.5
- Narratives	66.7	47.8	54.5
- Poetry	41.7	26.1	27.3
- Impressionistic writing	83.3	69.6	100.0
NUMBER :	12	23	10

* In addition to being analyzed as part of a cluster, these items were matched individually and with appropriate items from the 1977 Interview and analyzed for statistically significant change.

APPENDIX E

Correlations of Teaching Practices and Student Writing Performance

1977

(N=44)

	Essay 1	Essay 2	Total Score
Estimated hours of writing by teachers not required for the job	.35**	.19	.28*
Amount of course material that is new	-.37**	-.29*	-.34*
Amount of writing for practical and social reasons	-.39*	-.42**	-.41*
Amount of writing for academic success	.12	.28*	.21
[1]Teaching report writing	.43**	.40**	.43**
[1]Teaching introspective writing	-.16	-.28*	-.23*
[1]Teaching poetry	-.32*	-.28*	-.31*
Length of class (1=semester; 2=year)	.42**	.48**	.47**

* $P \leq .05$

** $P \leq .01$

1. Coded 1=yes; 2=no.

APPENDIX E

Correlations of Teaching Practices and Student Writing Performance

1978

(N=44)

Class/Student Characteristics	Essay 1	Essay 2	Total Score
Length of class (1=semester; 2=year)	.07	.37**	.24
Percent of students writing complete sentences upon class entry	.06	.40**	.25
Percent of students writing complete paragraphs upon class entry	.07	.43**	.27*
Percent of students writing organized essays at class entry	.08	.33*	.23
Motivation of class	.36*	.23	.33*
Percent of class planning to attend a 4-year college	.19	.57**	.42**
Percent of class planning to attend a 2-year college	-.02	-.45**	-.24
Percent of class entering vocational training	-.29	-.29	-.39*
Percent of class entering the military	.07	-.57**	-.22
Teacher enjoyment of the class	.12	.29*	-.23
Teaching Practices			
Amount of new course material	.08	-.31*	-.22
Amount of writing for practical and social reasons	.19	-.49**	-.38*

(Teaching Practices, cont.)

	Essay 1	Essay 2	Total Score
Amount of writing for academic success	.29*	.35**	.39**
Amount of writing for pleasure	-.16	-.31*	-.27
Amount of writing completed during class time	-.25	-.31*	-.27
Average hours teacher spends reading student work	.33*	.35**	.42**
Amount of rewriting/revision encouraged	.31*	.21	.33*
Amount of prewriting	-.24	-.34*	-.35**
Use of student work as influence on course content	.35**	-.05	.23
[1]Mode of presentation : individual exercises	-.23	-.41**	-.37*
[1]Mode of presentation : small group activities	.25	.32*	.34*
[1]Individual conferences for feedback	-.46**	-.19	-.43**
[1]Use of students as audiences for peer feedback	.16	.30*	.26*
[1]Use of special exercises in prewriting	.19	.31*	.29*
[1]Teaching thesis statement	-.03	-.33*	-.19
[1]Teaching logic	-.34*	-.23	-.36
[1]Teaching paragraph development	-.31*	-.15	-.30*
[1]Teaching conclusions	-.13	.26*	.03
[1]Teaching rhetorical persuasion	-.25*	-.14	-.26*

(Teaching Practices, cont.)

	Essay 1	Essay 2	Total Score
[1]Teaching concrete details	-.04	.34*	.14
[1]Teaching narrative	.25*	.01	.18
[1]Teaching literary criticism	-.29*	.00	-.21
[1]Teaching spelling	-.02	.30*	.14

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

1. Coded 1=yes; 2=no.

APPENDIX F_1

INSERVICE PRESENTATIONS BY TITLE OR CONTENT

TITLE/CONTENT	HEARD BY INSERVICE X++ #1	#2	#3
The Writing Process	X	X	X
Small Groups in the Classroom	X	X	
Sentence Writing: Syntax and Sentence Combining	X	X	X
Expository Writing	X	X	X
Writing Sequence: K-6	XX		
Writing Sequence: 7-12	X X	X	X
Personal Writing: 7-10	X X		
Assessment/holistic grading	X	X	X X
The Basic Student	XX	X	XX
Analyiss of prose	X	X	
Writing techniques, K-8	X		
Writing Labs	X		
Coherence		X	X
Saturation Reporting		X	X
Advanced Placement		X	
Writing in different modes, for different audiences			X

X++ Participants from Inservices 1 and 2 were tested and interviewed in both years; Participants in #3 were interviewed only in 1978 and are included in figures for "New Inservice"

*Two XX indicates two presentations on this topic

APPENDIX F_2

Distribution of 77-78 Teacher Consultants and Staff By Institute Year

Institute Year	Percent of 77-78 TCs	Number of 77-78 TCs from Summer Institute Program	Current Staff	Total Fellows in Summer Institute Programs	Percent of Summer Institute Fellows currently acting as TCs
1974	27%	10	2	24	50%
1975	16%	6		25	24%
1976	14%	5		25	20%
1977	43%	16		29	55%
TOTALS	100%	37	2	103	Mean: 37%

APPENDIX G

Different Types of Writing *

1977 : The three types of writing were distinguished as a result of being followed by the lists appearing below :

TAXONOMY OF WRITING MODES. Using the following general categories to describe different kinds of writing, try to create a pciture of your class. Let us know roughly what proportion of time gets accorded to each of the three groups, by dividing 100% (of assignments given) three ways. After your rough estimate, circle the item in each list which you regularly include in your assignments.

(%) Type One : leads to creation of literary art.	(%) Type Two : Leads to mastery of forms of academic discussion.	(%) Type three : Leads to use of writing in business, vocational, social, civic situations.
journals	formal essay	business letter
introspecitve writing	literary criticism	job/college applications
Impressionistic writing	report writing	persuasive argument
note-taking on perceptions	logical argument	news writing
description	critical exposition	editorial
narratives	precis	advertisements
values clarification	other :	informational articles (informal essay to share information)
poetry		opinion
personal letters		question/discussion
other :		evaluation
		other :

1978 : In 1978 the three types of writing only appeared by name :

Out of their total time spent writing during the term, students spend approximately the following percentages on tehse three types of writing (a-c should total 100%):

_____a. Writing for personal pleasure and growth (creative writing, ungraded writing, etc.)

_____b. Writing for success in school (formal essays, literary criticism, report writing, etc.)

_____c. Writing for practical purposes (business letters, advertisements, applications, etc.)

* N.B. It should be strongly emphasized that only gross distinctions can be made in the three types of writing. Individual teachers' treatment of specific assignments could change the "type". (For example, a thorough treatment of a literary work and an author could change a "letter to the author" assignment from having only "practical/social" effects to imparting "academic" benefits as well.)

APPENDIX H

Factors Affecting Success in Writing

In your experience with students in general, which of the following have you found to be the most important factors bringing success in students' writing?

	INV*	COMP*	INS*
1. Frequency of writing assignments.	66.6%	85.0%	58.0%
2. Total amount of writing.	12.5%	30.0%	33.3%
3. Emotional climate of classroom.	66.6%	66.7%	25.0%
4. Instructional techniques.	66.6%	59.0%	66.7%
5. Evaluation techniques used.	66.6%	66.7%	50.0%
f. Other.++	50.0%	59.0%	33.3%

*INV = Invitational, COMP = Comparison Group, INS = Inservice Group.

++"Other" - Factors most frequently mentioned by all three groups : 1) Teacher's involvement, 2) Student's motivation and background, 3) Teacher as a writer, 4) Student's breadth of reading experience, 5) Writing topics that appeal to students, and 6) Making the student an editor (often through the use of peer feedback).